

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed on July 1, 2003 and the references cited therein have been carefully studied and, in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are most respectfully requested. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-141. By the current amendment, claims 1-141 are canceled without prejudice, and new claims 142-161 have been added. No new matter has been added by the current amendment, as support thereof can be found in the specification at, *inter alia*, Figures 1 and 2, and pages 9, 15-16 and 32-45. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to the specification as an application number was missing at page 3, line 3, page 20, line 15, and page 29, line 14. Additionally, the application number 60/317,540 was twice repeated in the paragraph bridging pages 30 and 31. The requested corrections to the specification have been made herein. The Examiner has also objected to the embedded hyperlink at page 25, line 27. The embedded hyperlink has been deleted.

The Examiner objects to the description of Figure 7 and Figure 8 as set forth on page 17, in the paragraph bridging pages 25 and 26, and in the paragraph bridging pages 33 and 34. The Examiner states that the description is confusing as it is unclear how Figure 7 and Figure 8 illustrate HOMO and/or LUMO. Applicants respectfully submit that the Figure 7 and Figure 8 and the corresponding descriptions are not unclear as a person of skill in the art would recognize that the figures are the three dimensional orbital representation calculated for the HOMO orbital and the LUMO orbital.

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As all of the rejected claims have been canceled, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been rendered moot.

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Igarashi et al. (U.S. 2001/0019782), Grushin et al. (2002/0121638 A1), Thompson et al. (US 2002/0034656 A1), and Lamanski et al. (U.S. 2002/0182441 A1). The claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the above references. All of the rejected claims


have been canceled herein. New claims 142-161 are directed to nine specified compounds and to devices comprising those compounds. Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are patentable in view of Igarashi et al., Grushin et al., Thompson et al. and Lamanski et al.

The Examiner has rejected the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-28 of co-pending Application No. 09/978,455. All of the rejected claims have been canceled herein. New claims 142-161 are directed to nine specified compounds and to devices comprising those compounds. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting has been rendered moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and request that such action be taken. If for any reason the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application would be advanced by contact with the Applicants' attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: November 3, 2003

By:   
Kevin T. Godlewski  
Reg. No. 47,598

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004

Direct Dial: 212-908-6203  
Fax: 212-425-5288  
General Tel: 212-425-7200